

An Evaluation of Ohio Familicides Between 1959-1988

Abstract

Research often suggests that simplified categorization of homicides is the best way to represent these cases. However, this oversimplification proves dangerous for the cases itself and the false patterns they attribute information to. In the case of familicide cases from The Ohio Domestic Violence Homicide Database it is revealed that these cases share more commonalities with non-familicidal spouse murders in regard to circumstances. Therefore, why do we define cases by a simplified generic label rather than using the rich detail present in these cases in a simplified way to represent them? An analysis of cases asserted to be familicides reveals a variety of circumstances that put the term familicide under question as the defining term used to represent these killings. Through newspaper accounts, police records, and The Ohio Domestic Violence Homicide Database as sources of information, familicide defined cases were tracked to reveal twenty spouse caused familicide defined cases. Through the careful examination of these cases, it is revealed that there are four definable themes that play heavily into the circumstances of these cases. These themes include shame, depression, marital problems, and possessiveness. The causes of possessive spousal familicides can be further broken down into custody disputes, jealousy, control issues, and rage. This paper aims to display the familicides that occurred between 1959 and 1988 in this random cluster of thirty-six Ohio counties are not easily categorized through the complex information present in these cases that identify additional themes.

Introduction

Spousal murders sometimes end in the murders of one or more victims besides the spouse. Researchers often assume that such familicides have much in common, but in fact, the term familicide, defined as the occurrence of multiple-victim homicide incidents in which the suspect kills their spouse and one or more children (Yliopisto, 2017), does not adequately represent the homicides that become grouped together in this category. Rather there is a wide array of ways each familicide can be defined. The diverse causes and circumstances of familicides are often ignored when scholars try to group them together. That diversity can be seen in the familicides committed by spouses that appear in the Ohio Domestic Violence Database. Each of these twenty incidents occurring between 1959 and 1988, could easily be described as familicides because the suspects killed multiple members of their families. These cases cluster into four smaller groups, each of which has more in common with certain types of non-familicidal spouse murders than they do with familicides.

The Ohio Domestic Violence Homicide Database is a database that I created using the information collected by myself, Dr. Roth, and The Homicide Research team at The Ohio State University history department, to track domestic violence cases in the state of Ohio through utilizing the information currently accessible in newspapers, police files, death certificates, coroner's records, and databases maintained by the National Center for Health Statistics, the Ohio Department of Health, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. My own original research

was conducted in digitized historic newspapers from Ohio. The spouse-caused familicides are a subgroup of a much greater set of data that I sorted and classified to better understand domestic violence in Ohio. The cases are drawn from a clustered random sample of all reported homicides in thirty-six counties, 1959-1988.

Each of the twenty cases of spouse-murder familicides in the database was assigned a number before it was regrouped into one or more subgroups of homicides following examination. The information on each case includes the relationships between the perpetrator and the victims, the weapon use, court information, demographic information on age, gender, race, and geographical information on residence and the scene of the crime. The more closely we look, the more different familicides look, than alike. Indeed, they share more in common with the homicide of various types that took only one life, than they do with one another.

Homicides from a clustered random sample of thirty-six counties in Ohio were collected and examined to learn about the history and patterns of homicide in the state (The Ohio Domestic Violence Homicide Database, 2019). This information is within the barriers of the years 1959- 1988, the thirty-six counties. These groups include a variety of demographical settings including urban, small town, and rural. The database currently contains thirty-six out of the eighty-eight counties in Ohio. The counties represented are; Adams, Athens, Belmont, Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Columbiana, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Delaware, Fayette, Franklin, Hamilton, Harrison, Highland, Jackson, Logan, Marion, Meigs, Mercer, Miami, Morgan,

Laura Janosik

Morrow, Muskingum, Noble, Ottawa, Perry, Pickaway, Pike, Preble, Scioto, Seneca, Stark, Vinton, Warren, and Wayne.

Out of the information collected from all of these counties between 1959-1988, twenty cases of familicide were identified. Five occurred in Cuyahoga county, four occurred in Hamilton county, two occurred in Franklin and Stark counties, and the remaining seven cases occurred individually in Belmont county, Butler county, Clermont county, Delaware county, Fayette county, Muskingum county, and Wayne county. It appears that despite the exclusion of city homicide cases from Cuyahoga county, Hamilton county, and Franklin, these counties are still intensely visible in this dataset. The data was excluded from these three areas because the large populations displayed larger amounts of homicide cases. The concern is that these three counties would have overpowered the detail being discussed and overpower the patterns displayed. However, the overall pool of familicides identified comes from a wide array of counties.

The database examined each case and defined it based on the details stated within them. While examining cases believed to be a familicide, there were specific indicators present that led to the classification of these cases, some of the cases directly using the word familicide to describe the narrative of events. In addition, another indicator was observed when a case followed the definition of a familicide case scenario or when a family member committed mass murder or attempted murder towards multiple family members and, in some cases, followed this by committing suicide.

While these cases are easily identifiable as familicide through the story told that identifies additional themes. The information available in three of these cases includes limited information about the cause or reveals the presence of only vague problems. But the rich information available on the remaining cases reveals that the four fundamental causes of spousal familicides including shame, depression, marital problems, and possessiveness. The causes of possessive spousal familicides can be further broken down into custody disputes, jealousy, control issues, and rage.

Shame

It appears when suspects are experiencing shame they do not think rationally about their situations. In case one, the shame of a molestation accusation was a major factor in the events that proceeded. In Belmont County on August 1st, 1961, Clyde Neuhart shot his three children Dean, Jean, and Norman, then killed his wife, Peggy Neuhart, before turning the gun on himself. Mrs. Neuhart had a restraining order issued towards her husband before these homicides. It was issued under the accusation of molesting his three children. Therefore, while this case is a familicide, there are representations of other definable events going on, including the accusation of molestation. It is plausible to view these prior circumstances as part of the causation for the mass murder of this family. These occurrences are significant as they speak to the motivation behind the suspect's choice to kill his family and himself. The accusation of molestation alone is

enough to ignite shame for the suspect. In these cases, there is not enough detail to know if Mr. Neuhart was guilty of this accusation or if it was a statement made during their separation.

Financial difficulties are another motivator for shame in the suspect's mind. Within case five, in Cuyahoga County on December 3th, 1965, Hanns M. Ledermann age forty-three, shot his wife Sherrie, age forty-five, and their son fifteen-year-old Gregg II. Police found Mr. Ledermann in his pajamas, laying against a couch in the living room with the pistol in his hand, pointed towards his head. He committed suicide by firing a bullet into his mouth. This case suggested financial difficulties led the suspect to feel concerned for himself and his family's future, therefore, leading him to commit a familicide to avoid personal shame from not being able to provide. Mr. Ledermann waited until his family was asleep and chose to shoot both his wife and son directly in the head, insinuating he intended to kill them quickly rather than cause suffering. In case eleven, In Franklin County on November 25th, 1959, Frederick Bauman, age thirty-two, killed his two sons and himself on Thanksgiving Eve. Edith Jane, age twenty-nine, the wife and mother of this family, returned home and found radios on loud and lights on. Her husband and sons were dead in the son's bedroom. Mr. and Mrs. Bauman experienced both domestic and financial problems that placed a strain on their relationship and their family as a whole. Similar to case five, the struggle that results from financial difficulties paired with other factors causes the suspect to feel ashamed of themselves. In these rare cases, these stressors add up to the mass murder of families.

Another indicator of shame present in these cases was job stability. This form of shame while it could be connected to financial difficulties also has unique elements to personal failure from the suspect differently. In case fifteen, Hamilton County on February 13th, 1984 Mostafa Ansari killed his wife, Karin Ansari age forty and his three daughters Jasmine Ansari age ten, Nadia Ansari age ten, and Tania Ansari age seven. It was suggested that Mr. Ansari had some concerns about the health of his business. There was no sign of trouble or strife in the family, according to a neighbor. Mr. Ansari and his business partner, William Menrath, had made little progress on turning the Lincoln School on Delta Ave into condos causing Mr. Ansari financial concern. The children & Mrs. Ansari were well-liked in the neighborhood and socialized with neighbors. In addition, case eighteen discusses In Stark County on April 29th, 1971, John Yarveski shot his wife Irene Yarveski age forty-one and his son John Yarveski age thirteen before driving to Central Catholic Highschool to shoot his other son Gary Yarveski seventeen before shooting himself. Mr. Yarveski had not worked since February, but “did not appear excessively concerned” when relatives spoke to Mr. Yarveski on Sunday before the murders. Mr. Yarveski’s mother had died accidentally at her home on 1/27/1971, which may have “preyed on his mind.”. Mr. Yarveski was a WWII Army veteran. While relatives did not see his job loss as an indicator it could have still ignited concern especially when paired with his mother’s recent death.

Depression

The mental health of the suspects contributed to the acts they committed. Five cases used the words “depression”, “disturbed”, “breakdown”, and others to describe the suspects state of mind prior to the homicides committed. In case fifteen Mr. Ansari was described as a high ranking official under the Shah: director of international commerce. He immigrated to the United States in 1979. Prior to living in Ohio, the family fled to Norway, to stay with Mrs. Ansari relatives, but then came to the United States and received permanent green cards in October 1982. It is believed that he suffered from depression. A few years later Mr. Ansari killed his family. All of the victims were shot in their beds, wearing their bedclothes and showed no signs of struggle. The combination of having to escape from his homeland and the specified suggestion of depression brings the suspect mental wellbeing under question. In case sixteen In Hamilton County on July 25th, 1984, Kenneth Rohman killed his wife Janet Rohman age fifty-three and his daughter Karen Rohman age twenty-nine before turning the gun on himself. The daughter had been living in an apt in Clifton but returned to her parents’ home three weeks before the shooting. Mr. Rohman called police to say he had shot his wife and daughter and that he was going to shoot himself. Mr. Rohman had been depressed over health problems. In case nineteen in Stark County on March 20th, 1973 David Tucker shot his wife Alma Tucker then his son David Tucker in the head before shooting himself with a different gun. Relatives said that Mr. Tusker, “appeared emotionally disturbed recently and counseling had been recommended to the family.”. The appearance of Mr. Tucker's shift in behavior that caused great enough concern from those around him to suggest counseling displays a problem with his mental wellbeing. The shift in Mr. Tucker's mentality was likely a driving force in his actions.

Two cases in this subset of familicides committed by spouses were committed by the wives. Another commonality between these two cases is that both involved specifically defined mental health illnesses, postpartum depression and a nervous breakdown resulting in hospitalization. The other cases that discuss depression and mental illness did not discuss specific conditions. Case two, in Butler County on December 5th, 1967, Janice Moorman shot and killed her husband, age thirty-two, and daughter, age six, while they were in bed. She then went on to commit suicide by shooting herself. Her infant son, who was also present in the home, was not harmed during the killings. It is believed Mrs. Moorman was suffering from postpartum depression after the birth of her son four months prior. Mrs. Moorman called her sister before killing herself to confess what she had done in a "state of depression." She left a note saying she "could not shoot the baby.". During the previous evening, a neighbor had visited the family as noted that Mrs. Moorman was in "good spirits.". In this case, the suspect's state of depression played a significant role in her actions. When Mrs. Moorman confessed her actions to her sister, she specified that it was her state of depression that caused her to commit these murders. The status of Mrs. Moorman's mental health was the driving force of her actions in this case. When a case is categorized as a familicide, it is difficult to understand how and why. Mrs. Moorman shot her husband and daughter in bed, which suggests they may have been asleep. With this in mind, it appears Mrs. Moorman intended to kill her family quickly rather than to cause excessive violence or pain. This is additionally notable through her incapability to kill her son. Mrs. Moorman ended the lives of two of her family members and understanding her motivation behind doing so reveals causation that can be examined and tracked. Rather than looking at this homicide of random acts of violent occurrences, seeing the detail reveals the whole story, which

helps those who investigate and work towards preventing these types of crime. In case nine Delaware County, April 22nd, 1962, Janice Cox killed her three children; Dennis Cox, age ten, Elizabeth Cox age four, and Teresa Cox, age eight, then herself. Wallace D. Cox, the husband of the suspect and father of the victims, returned home from work to discover his whole family was dead. Mrs. Cox suffered a nervous breakdown the year before and was hospitalized as a result of it. This case specified multiple times that Mrs. Cox suffered from depression and suffered from a mental breakdown, displaying the injured status regarding her mental health. With the state of her mental health being so severe that it resulted in her being hospitalized, it is plausible that her mental status was a contributor and possible driving force of the murders she committed. Janice Cox is one of two women in the familicide data set to have committed a familicide. In addition, this case should be categorized as a mental illness case as well.

Marital problems

Marital problems negatively impact the relationship between the couples and the families. In case five the victims were all in pajamas suggesting they may have been shot by Mr. Ledermann while sleeping; there were no signs of struggle. A neighbor believed that the family had been living there for seven years. Also, they said the family appeared happy and closely-knit. However, the police said the couple had been having marital and financial difficulties. The combination of marital and financial difficulties is a common trend seen in familicide cases; however, they are not required. Cases involving marital difficulties are associated with the suspect feeling disconnected from the family unit and wanting to maintain that closeness. In case

fourteen in Hamilton County, on August 15th, 1969, Robert L. Humphery, age forty-four, killed his wife Nancy Humphrey, age forty-five and their son Jack, age ten. Two other Humphery children escaped without injury: Donald, age twenty-one, Terry, age fourteen, and Craig, age eight. Donald and Terry were Nancy's two children from a previous marriage, they fled from the home when the shooting began, and Craig was found hiding behind his bedroom door. The suspect, Mr. Humphery, was described as having been just promoted to district manager, a former marine, and having had marital problems for several years. He had not been expected in the Cincinnati area until after Labor Day. The outlier, in this case, despite seemingly normal conditions, prior to the homicides, there was a presence of marital problems that spanned years. It appears Mrs. Humphrey was the target first as she was killed first. The children were also targeted in this case, seen not only through the killing of the one son but the active efforts of the other three to run and hide from Mr. Humphrey. While the motivation is unclear, it is notable that Mr. Humphrey's violent intentions appeared to include both his wife and the children, in comparison to other cases in which the homicide or infliction of physical and emotional pain may be more precisely targeted towards an individual. Through understanding Mr. Humphrey's intentions, we come closer to understanding his motivations for committing these murders.

When marital problems were present in these cases the husband made the choice to kill himself and the children, therefore isolating the wife. While the violence is directed at physically directed at the children the intent to cause pain appears to be directed at the wife. In case three the suspect could have possibly been trying to escape the domestic troubles between himself and his wife and wanted his children, and the family cat to be with him. Perhaps his goal was to

isolate his wife and cause her pain by removing all of the family members she had. It may be challenging to assess Mr. McBeth's true motivations, but the way he committed these homicides reveals that while he killed the children, he did so non-violently and in an ironic turn it appears the pain he caused was directed at his wife who, while not a victim of the homicide, was a victim of trauma through horrendously losing her family. In this case, the standard definition of familicide still fits. However, it holds the additional intricacy that stems from the wife being a surviving victim of a homicide meant to impact her. Mr. McBeth shot each of his children twice in the temple, suggesting he intended to kill them rather than cause pain. The suspect could have possibly been trying to escape the domestic troubles between himself and his wife and wanted his children, and the family cat to be with him. In case eleven, Mr. Bauman said "Sorry, Jane, but you hurt me for the last time. I did want to be friends here with you and our sons, but you lost your head again and hurt me again. The boys had a ball at the store. Todd had all the cars and trains on the floor, and Chuck looked at the bikes. We then drove by the store, and they got a look at you, and you went over to the phone.". According to neighbors, the family was well-liked, "but just did not belong together." Mr. and Mrs. Bauman experienced both domestic and financial problems that placed a strain on their relationship and their family as a whole. In addition, it appears when Mrs. Bauman told Mr. Bauman that she no longer loved him, it could have pushed him over the edge, leading him to his final drastic actions. The intimate details within the suicide note written by Mr. Bauman places blame on Mrs. Bauman for his actions as he accuses her of "losing her head," and "hurting him." While Mr. Bauman killed his sons and himself, the intention to cause pain appears directed towards Mrs. Bauman.

Case thirteen displays a circumstance in which the reconnection of a divorced couple reignited the marital problems present within their relationship. In Hamilton County, on September 3rd, 1962, Fred Burton shot and killed his ex-wife Clara Moore. He also shot at his stepson, Ronnie Moore, age seventeen before turning the gun on himself. The couple had recently reconnected after having been divorced for a year. Mr. Burton drove up alongside the car two doors from his ex-wives home, where Ms. Moore was sitting with her son. Mr. Burton and Ms. Moore talked for a while, then he drew a gun from his glove compartment, jumped out, allowing the car to roll ahead and shot Ms. Moore. He also fired at Ronnie Moore an additional two times before shooting himself. This case insinuates that it was the discussion between Mr. Burton and Ms. Moore that could have instigated the violence as the suspect went to his gun during the conversation. The suspect targeted his ex-wife first, possibly as a result of something said during the conversation. In addition, he also took the time to shoot at his stepson, suggesting he has anger directed at him as well. An examination of their relationship notes this couple had divorced in the past, suggesting an event occurred, resulting in them separating. The presence of an entity that disconnects these two individuals proposes a possible motive that, while it cannot be explicitly defined, can suggest it exists based on the history of the relationship.

Possessiveness

The oxford dictionary defines possessiveness as, “the fact of demanding total attention or love and not wanting somebody to be independent”. Similarly, all cases that fall under this category share in this definition with unique interpretations. Possessiveness branches out into

custody issues, jealousy and control, and rage. All of these cases share a theme of the suspect feeling entitled to his family, his wife, his property, and other entities. These cases display the drastic reactions of suspects as a result of them not receiving the attention they want.

Custody

When marital difficulties occur in a household the custody of the children is a topic of added strain for the whole family. In case one, Mrs. Neuhart had a restraining order issued towards her husband before these homicides. It was issued under the accusation of molesting his three children. Regardless of the truth behind these accusations, it was used as a tool to gain custody of the children. Mr. Neuhart took his children to a dump off Badgerburg Rd, a very desolate road in Belmont County, and shot each of his children. In his suicide note, he said, "The kids are down Badgerburg Road right behind the trash pile.". He then went on to find his estranged wife and shot her as well. The suicide note continues, "I loved Peg and the kids too much to let them get away." Signed "Clyde.". After killing his family, Mr. Neuhart killed himself with a self-inflicted gunshot. In addition, the statement clearly placed Mrs. Neuhart in a position to gain custody, therefore Mr. Neuhart decided to commit familicide as the option he picked to regain custody of his children. In case eight, in Cuyahoga County, July 7th, 1976, John Greenwood age, thirty-seven, killed Darlene Greenwood, his wife, age thirty with two shots in the back and one shot to the chest. He also attacked his children, including Scott Greenwood, age seven, Chris Greenwood age five, and Tammy Greenwood, age nine. Scott was shot twice in the back, Chris was shot once in the back, and Tammy was wounded in the back, but not killed.

Neighbors specifically said he was possessive, paired with losing his wife and children in the divorce could have instigated Mr. Greenwood to respond violently. Mr. Greenwood's anger over the divorce had caused him to snap as reports suggest and lead to him committing these violent acts. Through killing his family, Mr. Greenwood gained back his family and the custody of the children he lost through the divorce. In case eleven Mrs. Bauman told Mr. Bauman that she no longer loved him, suggesting the beginning of separation and the possible loss of his children. Mr. Bauman took his sons out for what appears to be a fun father-son day, going to the toy store and going to see mom. When they returned home, Mr. Bauman waited until the boys were asleep to shoot them, suggesting he did not want them to be aware of the attack coming. These precautions were taken to avoid a violent death. Despite it being the boys that were killed, the intention was to inflict pain towards his wife.

Homeownership is another form of custody that occurred within these cases. In case seventeen In Muskingum County on October 4th, 1985, Mr. Heistand age seventy-two shot his ex-wife, Mrs. Heistand age fifty-seven and shot his son Harry B. Heistand age fifty-two and his daughter Arla Johnson age fifty-seven before shooting himself in the head. The family came to Mr. Heistand's apartment to serve him an eviction notice. Which he is reported to have received calmly before going upstairs and returning with his gun. To which he responded by shooting and killing his former wife and wounded two children who both needed surgery as a result. Both were last noted as being in stable condition. The daughter was shot in the abdomen and hip and the son was shot in the shoulder. Mr. Heistand fired a total of three shots at his ex-wife, two at his daughter, and one at his son, before turning the gun on himself and shooting himself in the

head. There was not any insinuation presented in this case that Mr. Heistands family was there to gang up on him. However, the appearance of his children on his ex- wife's side could have created the appearance that they were all ganging up on him during this awkward time of him losing his home. The eviction notice paired with the possible feeling of attack from his family could have pushed Mr. Heistand to use violence as a form of protecting himself not from a threat but from the feeling of being attacked.

Jealousy and control

Jealousy, possessiveness, and control are common themes in these cases that intertwine to display male domination. In case eleven, Mr. Bauman took the boys to a toy store "for a last good time" then to Scioto View Pharmacy on Fishinger so that they could look through the window at their mother "for the last time." Mr. Bauman then took the boys home and waited until they fell asleep to shoot them. Next, he committed suicide by shooting himself in the mouth. The couple had been having domestic problems "for a long time.", arguing about money, "and a lot of little things that most every couple argues about from time to time," according to police. Mrs. Bauman had told Mr. Bauman said, "she did not love him anymore" about three weeks before the murders. In Mr. Bauman's suicide note, he said "Sorry, Jane, but you hurt me for the last time. I did want to be friends here with you and our sons, but you lost your head again and hurt me again. The boys had a ball at the store. Todd had all the cars and trains on the floor, and Chuck looked at the bikes. We then drove by the store, and they got a look at you, and you went over to the phone.". Mr. Bauman is using the murder of his children to take control

back from his wife he says it has hurt him in the past. In case three In Clermont County on July 31st, 1959, Mrs. McBeth returned home from work early to find her two children shot to death in their beds & her husband dead in the hallway. James K. McBeth, age forty-seven, killed his daughter, Kathy, age six and son, Scottie, age eight. Both children were shot twice in the temple. The suspect also killed the family cat before shooting himself in the stomach. Mr. McBeth chose to wait until his wife was not at the residence to commit the attack against his family. However, the suicide note discussed domestic troubles suggests that Mr. McBeth was possibly trying to hurt his wife as a result of their fighting by taking control through killing himself and their children.

In some cases, the spouses have already separated in some form, but the presence of these themes is still present. In case one, the presence of possessive behavior suggests the suspect felt a level of authority over the victims and killing his victims displays the ultimate representation of the suspect's ability to maintain control. Mr. Clyde said, "I loved Peg and the kids too much to let them get away." Signed "Clyde.". Through their deaths, he has taken full control away from them and their ability to leave him. Finally, through killing himself as well, there is the notion that he will remain in control due to a lack of consequence and remain with his family permanently through death. In case four in Cuyahoga County on October 26th, 1961, Phillip J. Alabise, age twenty-eight, killed his wife Eleanor Alabise, and his children Lori Alabise, age four, Sheri Rose age two, and stepsister Connie King, age seven. He also attacked his sister-in-law Mrs. Joseph Bergoc, age thirty-two. Mrs. Alabise had filed divorce and began dating a man she was introduced to by her sister. Mr. Alabise was jealous of his wife's new

relationship. This can be seen through his violence towards his wife's sister who is stated as being the one who set up her sister with this new person. Mr. Alabise displayed his possessiveness towards his family despite being separated from his wife through his violent outburst to display his anger towards the situation. In case eight reports suggest Mr. Greenwood had snapped, which caused these murders to occur. Mr. Greenwood had never accepted divorce that occurred the March prior and wanted to get the family back together. Witnesses had testified during divorce hearing that there was a history of beating his wife. Neighbors and friends said Mr. Greenwood was overly possessive. There were also reports of abuse towards the children. However, family survivors could not recall abuse. The coroner ruled a murder-suicide. The injuries suggest they could have been trying to get away from Mr. Greenwood as all four of them were shot multiple times and at least once in the back. The aggressive nature of these murders insinuates control over them, and by committing suicide, displays the idea to some suspects that the family is back together. In case seventeen Mr. Heistand received an eviction notice from his ex-wife and two children. He responded by shooting and killing his former wife and wounding his two children who needed surgery as a result. Mr. Heistand could have felt the need to control the situation as the eviction paired with the presence of all three of his family members as an attack against him.

Rage

When these couples separated the suspects felt angry about the circumstances and acted out in extreme violence. In case four As Mr. Alabise stated, he was the perpetrator of domestic

violence in the home before the homicides took place towards both the children and his wife. At the time of the murder, he showed violent tendencies towards the children, but the brunt of his aggression was towards his wife. Furthermore, Mr. Albise revealed in his confession that his reason for killing his children was to prevent them from testifying against him in a court situation regarding their mother's murder. Mr. Albise's motivation behind killing his children and wife stem from two separate purposes. Mr. Albise wanted his wife to be hurt, and his children were pawns that he could not risk having to tell others what he did. In this violent scene, Mr. Albise shot his wife eight times. Mrs. Albise's body was found near a chair with her daughters lying around her on the floor by a neighbor, Patrick J. Lamont, who had heard the incident. Mr. Albise was charged with first-degree murder. Mrs. Albise had filed divorce and began dating a man she was introduced to by her sister, which could have contributed to his anger towards her. The term familicide does not reveal if the killing was directed at a specific individual; instead, it insinuates that the suspect intended to kill all family members. In case eight reports suggest Mr. Greenwood had snapped, which caused these murders to occur. Mr. Greenwood had never accepted divorce that occurred the March prior and wanted to get the family back together. Witnesses had testified during the divorce hearing that there was a history of Mr. Greenwood beating his wife. There were also reports of abuse towards the children. However, family survivors could not recall abuse. In this case, the suspect appears to have had a history of causing domestic violence, according to friends and neighbors. Neighbors specifically said he was possessive, paired with losing his wife and children in the divorce could have instigated Mr. Greenwood to respond violently. The injuries the victims suffered suggest they could have been trying to get away from Mr. Greenwood as all four of them were shot multiple times and at least

once in the back each. The aggressive nature of these murders insinuates Mr. Greenwood's anger regarding the divorce had led to him committing these violent acts.

In these cases, there was a notable history of violence present in the relationship prior to the homicides. In case ten In Fayette County on November 23rd, 1978, Mr. Gregg killed his wife, Susan Gregg, his daughters, Kristi, age four, and Carmen, age one. Mr. Gregg had driven the family to Wheeling for Thanksgiving Day. They were driving back to Norwood when the suspect pulled the car to the side of the road and parked. A Fayette County Deputy, Robert W. McArthur, pulled alongside to see if they needed assistance when Mrs. Gregg waved to him. As she tried to get out of the car, Mr. Gregg opened fire on her and his children. He also shot himself before the deputy could react. Mr. Gregg had a lengthy criminal record and scars on his wrist from a previous suicide attempt. The Wheeling police were quoted calling Mr. Gregg "a bad egg.". Mr. and Mrs. Gregg were martially estranged, possibly igniting tension that led to Mr. Gregg's violence. An unfortunate but common theme in many homicide cases is the use of violence as a means of control. While this has been a common trend in familicide cases, it can be argued that control is a common trend in all homicide cases. Therefore, it is not necessary to define a familicide or any homicide for that matter; instead, it is an additional and revealing category that speaks to the driving forces of individual murders. In case twenty in Wayne County on February 8th, 1969, Mr. Gloeckner shot his wife Judith Gloeckner age twenty-eight, and his two kids Elizabeth Gloecknek age one and David Gloeckner age four. Mr. Gloeckner also killed the family dog before committing suicide. In Wayne County on February 8th, 1969, He Left suicide note. "She pushed me a little too hard.". Mrs. Gloeckner had filed for divorce on

Laura Janosik

10/25/1968 due to the neglect and cruelty caused by her husband. The couple had pursued psychiatric help and the suspect had called his psychiatrist after he killed his family. Mrs. Gloeckner had talked of moving back to Pittsburgh to get away from Mr. Gloeckner. The neighbors knew there was trouble, they could hear them “screaming at each other” even with the windows closed.

Motive unknown

When the motive of a case is unknown as noted in these three cases, the cases can still be classified using a variety of categories. The information provided can reveal; the weapons used and how they were used, the suspect and victims, the charge, and more. Through these pieces, a framework can be built that properly presents each of these cases. In case six in Cuyahoga County on July 20th, 1966, William Johnston, age thirty, shot Mary Anne Johnston, his twenty-eight-year-old wife, and their son, William Johnston Jr., who was six months old at the time. Mr. Johnston's body was found in the master bedroom with his wrists slashed with razor blades and a self-inflicted 20-gauge shotgun wound to his head. There was not a specific motive in the case reported. The police discovered bodies when a custodian of the apartment building was asked by Mrs. Johnston's mother why no one had answered her phone calls. He could not enter their door but saw blood and called the police. Mrs. Johnston's mother saw no signs of trouble, nor did neighbors as they were considered a "nice" couple. In this case, the couple was viewed by those close to them, including family and neighbors, to be happy. Many familicide cases involve the police speaking with those who may have had regular contact with the family

before the murders. They may speak with neighbors, other family members, work colleges, and more. Additionally, the couple lived in a "fashionable" apartment building, suggesting they were doing well financially. Therefore, determining the cause of cases like these becomes challenging. The perspective of third-party perspectives is a category in itself. Despite the perspective, in this case, not revealing an apparent plausible motive, it is still important as it reveals information about the couple's relationship. However, third party perspectives may not always reveal what is truly going on regardless it speaks to the perspective the family was projecting to those around them, whether real, fake, positive, and or negative.

In case seven in Cuyahoga County, February 1st, 1967, Walter J. Majewski, age forty-eight, shot Laverne Majewski, his forty-seven-year-old wife. He also shot his son nineteen-year-old Walter Majewski Jr. in the neck. Mr. Majewski displayed no intention to commit suicide. He simply intended to kill his wife and son for an unstated reason. This act of violence led to him being charged with murder one. In this case, the lack of detail makes it difficult to gauge what occurred. However, there is more detail than the definable familicide described. The lack of a suicide attempt suggests that Mr. Majewski wanted his wife and son dead for some unidentifiable reason. The homicide lead to Mr. Majewski being charged with murder one, this type of charge insinuates that some level of premeditation was involved. In this case, we know he was not acting in self-defense through the details that display the premeditated killings.

In case twelve in Franklin County, on October 7th, 1966, Clarence Love, shot and killed his wife Lillie Love and attempted to kill Leonard Langston Love, their son before turning the gun on himself. There was not any notable motive for the sudden rampage, but Mr. Love had been defined as "moody and quiet" for several days before the attack. Mrs. Love had come home early from work on Thursday and gone to bed. Clarence shot Lillie four times, which caused their son to wake up. Mr. Love said to his son, "I am going to kill you too." Mr. Love's attempt to kill his eighteen-year-old son resulted in his son being shot in the shoulder and scalp as he escaped. Then Mr. Love went to the basement and shot himself. While many close to the family seemed surprised by Mr. Love's action, the additional third-party information revealed that the suspect had been acting differently for a few days. While this does not tell us the exact motivation, a third-party statement category revealed information about the suspect's state of being, which suggests that whatever cause Mr. Loves change in mood could have significant insight into why he attempted to kill his family and himself. Also, it appears that while this case became a familicide when Mr. Love attacked his son, prior to this action, he could have intended to commit a murder-suicide as it appears his son's involvement stemmed from him waking up to the sound of his father killing his mother. If this was the case, is this a different type of familicide as one killing could be intentional and another collateral? It is important to note when defining any case, not only who was killed but what the intentions behind each individual killing was, provided the information is accessible.

Relationship

Each familicide case clearly defined the relationship the suspect had with the victim. The relationships present in this dataset include husbands, wives, estranged husbands, estranged wives, ex-husband, ex-wife, mothers, fathers, and children. Out of the twenty cases, twelve out of twenty were married, five of the twenty were married and estranged, and three of the twenty were divorced. Each of these cases had a suspect that committed the familicide with sixteen committed by husbands, two committed by ex-husbands, and two committed by wives. This pattern is very revealing as only two out of the twenty cases involved female suspects, and of these two both had specified mental health concerns. In case two, Mrs. Moorman was suffering from postpartum depression and in case nine, Mrs. Cox was suffering from a nervous breakdown that put her in the hospital. What does it say when the two cases that involve women also involve clinical mental distress and illness while the other eighteen involve males without clearly diagnosed conditions? Perhaps this suggests that there should be a closer examination placed on how male suspects respond to the themes discussed throughout this paper. Men are largely represented in mass killing patterns. Men have a tendency to suffer from relationship or employment problems, they are more likely to argue, and are generally the ones who are ousted from the home following a divorce or separation. Men are also more likely to use their occupation to define their own self-worth. (Levin, 1998).

The victims of these families varied in numbers case by case; however, the total types of individuals involved in these cases were fifty-seven victims total and an additional fifteen if the suspects killing themselves counted as another victim of the homicides. This information reveals that familicide cases are committed by different members of the couples within these families;

however, while there are cases with both male and female suspects, the majority of cases were committed by males.

Weapon

The weapons used by the suspects in these cases provide additional insight into these familicide cases. Interestingly nineteen of the twenty cases of familicide were committed with the use of a gun. In the twentieth case, the weapon was not specified. Weapon choice, along with weapon use, is very revealing in homicide cases as it provides insight into the intentions of the suspect. For example, how a gun is used, and the number of shots fired shows some insight into the suspect's mind. In some cases, the gun appeared to be used to complete the murders quickly and without pain being a notable intention. In case five Mr. Lederman shot Mrs. Ledermann, his wife. He shot her once in the head as she was lying in bed in the couple's bedroom. Gregg II was found in the bed in the rear bedroom, shot in the head once. The victims were all in pajamas suggesting they may have been shot by Mr. Ledermann while sleeping; there were no signs of struggle which suggests Mr. Ledermann's intention was to kill them rather than to cause pain with the gun. In comparison, in case four, Mr. Alabise shot his wife eight times; this paired with the history of domestic violence and anger of the suspect suggests that he intended to use this weapon to inflict pain as a way to display his anger towards the wife. He also shot his wife's sister who had recently set her up with someone new and the children.

It appears guns were used in two distinctly different ways consistently throughout the twenty cases and as seen in cases four and five. The first way guns were used was to quickly end the life of the victims through a direct headshot, and in some cases, while the victims were asleep. This method shows the perpetrator had some level of sympathy for the victims, even if it is only on a subconscious level as the desire to prevent pain and suffering is evident. The second-way guns were used in a chaotic rage in which the case described a scene of multiple victims running and the suspect aggressively pursuing them with the intention to shoot them multiple times and without any regard for suffering and pain inflicted. In these cases, the violence was directed at one individual, in many cases, the wife and the rest of the family members that suffered were collateral damage.

Court Information

After these homicides were committed, an investigation occurred that identified the suspect of the homicide. In some of the cases, the information surrounding the judicial process was revealed. This information presented can include the charge, the conviction, and sometimes no information at all. While familicide cases do not require the suspect to commit suicide to be classified as a familicide case, it was a common, occurring trend within the cases examined. In cases that involve the suicide of the perpetrator, the court has limited options regarding how to proceed. Of the twenty cases, fifteen involved a suspect that had killed themselves through some form of suicide, three cases did not have the information about the suspect's state of being or court status listed, and two cases stated that the suspect was charged with murder one. In the first

case, case four, Mr. Albise from Cuyahoga County was charged with murder was case four, the suspect was charged and convicted, there was no evidence that the suspect had any intention of committing suicide. Rather his actions were directly associated with inflicting as much violence towards his family in his rage. This intention was abundantly clear during the investigation as the suspect was sentenced to eighty years in jail with the first opportunity for parole being at age one hundred and eight. Overall the cases in which the suspect did not intend to commit suicide or did not at all consisted of higher rates of violence. These cases appeared to involve the suspect taking out their rage on a specific victim and extending this violence to the rest of the family. In case seven, Mr. Majewski, from Cuyahoga County displayed no intention to commit suicide. He simply intended to kill his wife and son for an unstated reason. This act of violence led to him being charged with murder one, suggesting he premeditated these murders. While it is unclear what Mr. Majewski motives were, the charge reveals his actions were premeditated.

Race

Another factor to consider in knowing who committed these homicides is race. After examining the race of those involved in each case the data displayed; seventeen white families, two black families, and one Iranian immigrant family. These numbers suggest that familicide was random in relation to race, immigrant status. In addition, the Native American and Hispanic American populations of Ohio are very small which accounts for their lack of appearance in these familicide cases.

Urban and Rural

While examining the counties and the cases present within them the city-specific cases were removed from the dataset in favor of focusing on urban and rural areas. The cases found are disproportionately in the most densely populated urban counties. These cities being: Cuyahoga (greater Cleveland), Franklin (greater Columbus), and Hamilton (greater Cincinnati). However, the cases still in the counties, but outside the city limits of these three cities, were still included. The dense populations still managed to have a large presence in this dataset as eleven out of the twenty cases came from one of these three counties.

Conclusion

While there is value in looking at cases through this category, it is important not to oversimplify the story to avoid having to place a case in multiple categories, especially when the cases that have very little in common outside of a single factor used to define them. When each case is examined, additional and essential categorizations are scattered throughout the case, revealing additional complex layers of information. These events display the complex aspects that reveal multiple factors that can define each case. The use of the term familicide is vital to describe what is generally occurring, but there appears to be a repetitive theme of using this umbrella term to represent these types of homicides as a whole. Through this practice, the intricate details that are significant to these cases and make them unique become background thoughts. This practice of avoiding certain information for the sake of simplifying the

categorization process is a threat to the integrity of studying the factual events occurring in these homicides. Through a full assessment of these cases, all categories, including if the case is a familicide, should be tracked to examine homicide cases properly. Familicides are a significant category on their own. However, it is not the only category to define homicide and in every homicide case, multiple categories should be used to define a case. Looking at the repetition of themes within familicide cases may appear to show a link between these cases, suggesting they should be categorized under the same name. However, it is these links that are actually categories in it of themselves. Not only have these cases displayed the equivalence or more of the significance of these additional categories but they have also represented the flaws they come with using only one category to represent the whole of a case. There are many factors that make up each case which is why they are unique occurrences. Looking at cases this way may bring about more challenges due to an increase in information being examined but as a result, the information being used is significantly more accurate and revealing. Without a full examination of cases, the information presented is lacking the whole truth. These homicides are of a piece with many nondomestic homicides involving shame, depression, loss of control, rage, marital difficulties, and more complex categories. All homicides branch out into other relationships that can lead to homicide for similar reasons. Therefore, “familicide” should not be seen as a cohesive category, or a category apart from other homicides. Instead, it has value as a category among many.

Reference

Aho, A. L., Remahl, A., & Paavilainen, E. (2017, July). Homicide in the western family and background factors of a perpetrator. Retrieved from

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28565939>

Duwe, G. (2006, August 19). The patterns and prevalence of mass murder in twentieth-century America. Retrieved from

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/07418820400095971?needAccess=true>

Levin, J., & Fox, J. A. (2017). Multiple Homicide. *The Handbook of Homicide*, 249–267. doi: 10.1002/9781118924501.ch15

Oxford Dictionary-Possessiveness. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/us/definition/english/possessiveness?q=Possessiveness>

Appendix I

The Ohio Domestic Violence Homicide Database, 2019

Case 1

In Belmont County on August 1st, 1961, Clyde Neuhart shot his three children Dean, Jean, and Norman, then killed his wife, Peggy Neuhart, then turned the gun on himself. Mrs. Neuhart had a restraining order issued towards her husband before these homicides on the grounds that he molested the children. Following this, Mr. Neuhart took his children to a dump off Badgerburg Rd, a very desolate road in Belmont County, and shot each of his children. He then went on to find his estranged wife and shot her as well. After killing his family, Mr. Neuhart killed himself with a self-inflicted gunshot. In his suicide note, he said, "The kids are down Badgerburg Road right behind the trash pile." The suicide note continues, "I loved Peg and the kids too much to let them get away." Signed "Clyde."

Case 2

In Butler County on December 5th, 1967, Janice Moorman shot and killed her husband, age thirty-two, and daughter, age six, while they were in bed. She then went on to commit suicide by shooting herself. Her infant son, who was also present in the home, was not harmed during the killings. It is believed Mrs. Moorman was suffering from postpartum depression after the birth of her son four months prior. Mrs. Moorman called her sister before killing herself to confess what she had done in a "state of depression." She left a note saying she "could not shoot the baby.". During the previous evening, a neighbor had visited the family as noted that Mrs. Moorman was in "good spirits."

Case 3

In Clermont County on July 31st, 1959, Mrs. McBeth returned home from work early to find her two children shot to death in their beds & her husband dead in the hallway. James K. McBeth, age forty-seven, killed his daughter, Kathy, age six and son, Scottie, age eight. Both children were shot twice in the temple. The suspect also killed the family cat before shooting himself in the stomach. When Mrs. McBeth returned home, she was unable to enter and had to pick a basement lock to gain entry to the home. At the scene, "A note was found indicating domestic trouble" existed in the relationship.

Case 4

In Cuyahoga County on October 26th, 1961, Phillip J. Alabise, age twenty-eight, killed his wife Eleanor Alabise, and his children Lori Alabise age four, Sheri Rose age two, and stepsister Connie King age seven. He also attacked his sister-in-law Mrs. Joseph Bergoc, age thirty-two. In

this violent scene, Mr. Albise shot his wife eight times. Mrs. Alabise's body was found near a chair with her daughters lying around her on the floor by a neighbor, Patrick J. Lamont, who had heard the incident. It appeared that the daughters had tried to shield themselves with their hands before they were shot. Mr. Albise at first said he had slapped and beat his wife but did not admit to shooting her and three children. The defense attorneys tried to claim innocence by reason of insanity after Mr. Albise had confessed to the police but did not sign a confession and later refuted his statement. In court, he admitted that he shot his daughters as a mercy killing for fear of them reliving their mother's death and testifying against him. Mr. Albise was charged with first-degree murder.

Case 5

In Cuyahoga County on December 3th, 1965, Hanns M. Ledermann age forty-three, shot his wife Sherrie, age forty-five, and their son fifteen-year-old Gregg II. Police found Mr. Ledermann in his pajamas, laying against a couch in the living room with the pistol in his hand, pointed towards his head. He committed suicide by firing a bullet into his mouth. Sherrie Ledermann, his wife, was shot once in the head and was lying in bed in the couple's bedroom. Gregg II was found in the bed in the rear bedroom, shot in the head once. The victims were all in pajamas suggesting they had been shot while sleeping; there were no signs of struggle. A neighbor believed that the family had been living there for seven years and appeared happy and closely-knit. However, the police said the couple had been having marital and financial difficulties.

Case 6

In Cuyahoga County on July 20th, 1966, William Johnston, age thirty, shot Mary Anne Johnston, his twenty-eight-year-old wife, and their son, William Johnston Jr., who was six months old at the time. Mr. Johnston's body was found in the master bedroom with his wrists slashed with razor blades and a self-inflicted 20 gauge shot gun wound to his head. The police discovered the bodies when a custodian of the apartment building was asked by Mrs. Johnston's mother why no one had answered her phone calls. He could not enter their door but saw blood and called the police.

Case 7

In Cuyahoga County, February 1st, 1967, Walter J. Majewski, age forty-eight, shot Laverne Majewski, his forty-seven-year-old wife. He also shot his son nineteen-year-old Walter Majewski Jr. in the neck. According to the information provided, the son was in "fair condition at Marymount," the last time he was checked. Mr. Majewski displayed no intention to commit suicide. He only intended to kill his wife and son for an unstated reason. This act of violence led to him being charged with murder one.

Case 8

In Cuyahoga County, July 7th, 1976, John Greenwood age, thirty-seven, killed Darlene Greenwood, his wife, age thirty with two shots in the back and one shot to the chest. He also attacked his children, Scott Greenwood, age seven, Chris Greenwood age five, and Tammy Greenwood, age nine. Scott was shot twice in the back, Chris was shot once in the back, and

Tammy was wounded in the back, but not killed. Police speculated Mrs. Greenwood had been shot somewhere else or next to him in the car. A witness heard what sounded like firecrackers and saw a little boy in a white t-shirt with a red spot on opening a car door and falling out of it. Police found Mr. Greenwood unconscious at the wheel with his wife and children. He drove to Bedford and committed suicide through a self-inflicted bullet wound to the chest. He died in surgery at Marymount Hospital. Reports suggest Mr. Greenwood had snapped, which caused these murders to occur. Mr. Greenwood had never accepted divorce that occurred the March prior and wanted to get the family back together. The custody of the children went to Mrs. Greenwood in the divorce. Witnesses had testified during divorce hearing that there was a history of beating wife.

Case 9

In Delaware County, April 22nd, 1962, Janice Cox killed her three children; Dennis Cox, age ten, Elizabeth Cox age four, and Teresa Cox, age eight, then herself. Wallace D. Cox, the husband of the suspect and father of the victims, returned home from work to discover his whole family was dead. Mrs. Cox suffered a nervous breakdown the year before and was hospitalized as a result of it.

Case 10

In Fayette County on November 23rd, 1978, Mr. Gregg killed his wife, Susan Gregg, and his daughters, Kristi, age four, and Carmen, age one. Mr. Gregg had driven the family to Wheeling for Thanksgiving Day. They were driving back to Norwood when the suspect pulled the car to

the side of the road and parked. A Fayette County Deputy, Robert W. McArthur, pulled alongside to see if they needed assistance when Mrs. Gregg waved to him. As she tried to get out of the car, Mr. Gregg opened fire on her and his children. He also shot himself before the deputy could react. Mr. Gregg had a lengthy criminal record and scars on his wrist from a previous suicide attempt. The Wheeling police were quoted calling Mr. Gregg "a bad egg." Mr. and Mrs. Gregg were martially estranged, possibly igniting tension that led to Mr. Gregg's violence.

Case 11

In Franklin County on November 25th, 1959, Frederick Bauman, age thirty-two, killed his two sons and himself on Thanksgiving Eve. Edith Jane, age twenty-nine, the wife and mother, returned home and found radios on loud and lights on. Her husband and sons were dead in the son's bedroom. Mr. Bauman took the boys to a toy store "for a last good time" then to Scioto View Pharmacy on Fishinger so that they could look through the window at their mother "for the last time." Mr. Bauman then took the boys home and waited until they fell asleep to shoot them. Next, he committed suicide by shooting himself in the mouth. The couple had been having domestic problems "for a long time.", arguing about money, "and a lot of little things that most every couple argues about from time to time," according to police. Mrs. Bauman had told Mr. Bauman said, "she did not love him anymore" about three weeks before the murders. In Mr. Bauman's suicide note, he said, "Sorry, Jane, but you hurt me for the last time. I did want to be friends here with you and our sons, but you lost your head again and hurt me again. The boys had a ball at the store. Todd had all the cars and trains on the floor, and Chuck looked at the bikes. We then drove by the store, and they got a look at you, and you went over to the phone.".

Case 12

In Franklin County, on October 7th, 1966, Clarence Love, shot and killed his wife Lillie Love and attempted to kill Leonard Langston Love, their son before turning gun on himself. There was not any notable motive for the sudden rampage, but Mr. Love had been defined as "moody and quiet" for several days before the attack. Mrs. Love had come home early from work on Thursday and gone to bed. Clarence shot Lillie four times, which caused their son to wake up. Mr. Love said to his son, "I am going to kill you too." Mr. Love's attempt to kill his eighteen-year-old son resulted in his son being shot in the shoulder and scalp as he escaped. Then Mr. Love went to the basement and shot himself.

Case 13

In Hamilton County, on September 3rd, 1962, Fred Burton shot and killed his ex-wife Clara Moore. He also shot at his stepson, Ronnie Moore, age seventeen before turning the gun on himself. The couple had recently reconnected after having been divorced for a year. Mr. Burton drove up alongside the car two doors from his ex-wives home, where Ms. Moore was sitting with her son. Mr. Burton and Ms. Moore talked for a while, then he drew a gun from his glove compartment, jumped out, allowing the car to roll ahead and shot Ms. Moore. He also fired at Ronnie Moore an additional two times before shooting himself. This case insinuates that it was the discussion between Mr. Burton and Ms. Moore that could have instigated the violence as the suspect went to his gun during the conversation.

Case 14

In Hamilton County, on August 15th, 1969, Robert L. Humphery, age forty-four, killed his wife Nancy Humphrey, age forty-five and their son Jack, age ten. Three other Humphery children escaped without injury: Donald, age twenty-one, Terry, age fourteen, and Craig, age eight. Donald and Terry were Nancy's two children from a previous marriage; they fled from the home when the shooting began, and Craig was found hiding behind his bedroom door. The suspect, Mr. Humphery, was described as having been just promoted to district manager, a former marine, and having had marital problems for several years.

Case 15

In Hamilton County on February 13th, 1984 Mostafa Ansari killed his wife, Karin Ansari age forty and his three daughters Jasmine Ansari age ten, Nadia Ansari age ten, and Tania Ansari age seven. Mr. Ansari was described as a high ranking official under the Shah: director of international commerce. He immigrated to the United States in 1979. It is believed that he suffered from depression. Prior to living in Ohio, the family fled to Norway, to stay with Mrs. Ansari relatives, but then came to the United States and received permanent green cards in October 1982.

Case 16

In Hamilton County on July 25th, 1984, Kenneth Rohman killed his wife Janet Rohman age fifty-three and his daughter Karen Rohman age twenty-nine before turning the gun on himself. The daughter had been living in an apt in Clifton but returned to her parents' home 3 weeks

before the shooting. Mr. Rohman called police at 06:03 to say he had shot his family & was going to shoot himself. Mr. Rohman had reportedly been depressed over health problems.

Case 17

In Muskingum County, on October 4th, 1985, Mr. Heistand age seventy-two shot his ex-wife, Mrs. Heistand age fifty-seven, his son, Harry B. Heistand, age fifty-two, and his daughter, Arla Johnson, age fifty-seven before shooting himself in the head. The family came to Mr. Heistand's apartment to serve him an eviction notice. Which he is reported to have received calmly before going upstairs and returning with his gun. To which he responded by shooting and killing his former wife and wounded his two children who both needed surgery as a result. Both were last noted as being in stable condition. The daughter was shot in the abdomen and hip and the son was shot in the shoulder. Mr. Heistand fired a total of three shots at his ex-wife, two at his daughter, and one at his son, before turning the gun on himself and shooting himself in the head.

Case 18

In Stark County on April 29th, 1971, John Yarveski shot his wife Irene Yarveski age forty-one and his son John Yarveski age thirteen before driving to Central Catholic Highschool to shoot his other son Gary Yarveski seventeen before shooting himself. Mr. Yarveski had not worked since February, but "did not appear excessively concerned" when relatives spoke to Mr. Yarveski on Sunday before the murders. Mr. Yarveski's mother had died accidentally at her home on 1/27, which may have "preyed on his mind."

Case 19

Laura Janosik

In Stark County on March 20th, 1973 David Tucker shot his wife Alma Tucker then his son David Tucker in the head before shooting himself with a different gun. Relatives said that Mr. Tusker “appeared emotionally disturbed recently and counselling had been recommended to the family.”

Case 20

In Wayne County on February 8th, 1969, Mr Gloeckner shot his wife Judith Gloeckner age twenty-eight, and his two kids Elizabeth Gloecknek age one and David Gloeckner age four. Mr. Gloeckner also killed the family dog before committing suicide. He left a suicide note stating, “She pushed me a little too hard”. Mrs. Gloeckner had filed for divorce on 10/25/1968 due to the neglect and cruelty caused by her husband. The couple had sought psychiatric help, and he had called his psychiatrist after he killed his family. Mrs. Gloeckner had talked of moving back to Pittsburgh to get away from Mr. Gloeckner. The neighbors knew there was trouble, they could hear them “screaming at each other” even with the windows closed.